DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 252 904 CS 504 812

AUTHOR Fowler, Gene D.
TITLE Philosophical Assumptions and Contemporary Research Perspectives: A Course Supplement.
PUB DATE Nov 84
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (70th, Chicago, IL, November 1-4, 1984).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Research; Comparative Analysis; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Theories; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; *Research Methodology; Scientific Methodology
IDENTIFIERS Humanistic Research; Phenomenological Research; Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

To supplement course materials for classes in communication theory and research methods, this paper compares philosophical assumptions underlying three approaches to communication research: scientific, which stresses quantitative methods of analysis; humanistic, which encompasses many conflicting techniques but has as a common element--the modification of strictly quantitative methodology to include qualitative aspects; and phenomenological, which emphasizes language and users of language. The paper illustrates the interrelationship between theory and methods by contrasting the three approaches on four theoretical bases: (1) definition of subject matter, (2) identification of observational and analytical units, (3) concept of human action, and (4) structure of explanation. Acknowledging that a complex phenomenon such as spoken language can be studied in many different ways and noting support in the research literature for a pluralistic view of methods appropriate to the study of spoken language, the paper concludes that no single perspective can provide a full explanation of the process as well as an understanding of the "processing," and that the humanistic approach has the potential for wedding the traditional and phenomenological by using the approaches at different points in the entire research processes. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED252904

PHILOSOPHICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND CONTEMPORARY RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES: A COURSE SUPPLEMENT

Gene D. Fowler

Department of Communication
University of Colorado, Boulder
Boulder, Colorado 80309
303-492-5600

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gene D. Fowler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504 812

ABSTRACT

Supplementing course materials for classes in communication theory and research methods, this essay compares philosophical assumptions underlying three approaches to communication research: scientific, humanistic and phenomenological. These approaches are contrasted on four theoretical bases: 1) definition of subject matter; 2) identification of observational and analytical units; 3) concept of human action; and 4) structure of explanation.

Upperlevel undergraduate and graduate classes in research methodology and/or theory construction are offered in most communication programs. These classes differ from institution to institution according to the program emphasis and the expertise of the professors. Additionally, institutional limits on the availability of class offerings can restrict the breadth of classes intended to train students in research and theory. We never can teach all of the topics we would like or provide complete coverage of the range of potential research approaches and techniques. This essay provides a supplement to course materials for teachers of theory and methods by introducing and organizing discussion of contemporary research perspectives.

The essay describes and compares some philosophical assumptions underlying three distinct approaches to research in speech communication: scientific, humanistic and phenomenological. Such a comparison should be useful in a comparative methodology course. In the more common single methodology course, the identification of philosophical assumptions should be helpful in clarifying any of the three approaches.

Each approach is based on a particular view of humans and has implications for the focus of research in speech communication. The interrelationship between theory and methods will be illustrated by contrasting the three approaches on four theoretical bases: (1) definition of subject matter; (2) identification of observational and analytical units; (3) concept of human action; and (4) structure of explanation.[1]

Scientific Approach

The term "scientific approach" refers to the traditional variable analytic approach which stresses quantitative methods of analysis. The scientific approach is the received approach under the label of logical positivism or logical empiricism. The methodology of this approach first was developed and applied in the natural sciences and later was adapted to the social sciences. The purposes of theory in science are to explain, predict and control. A strength of this approach is the uniformity of the steps followed by all researchers as they pursue these goals. The logical empirical approach provides a set of research procedures which can be employed by different researchers investigating different aspects of human communication in various contexts. The results are objectively evaluated for their internal consistency and external applicability according to the explicit rules of statistical evaluation.

Although numerous techniques of investigation are possible, the guidelines for conducting scientific research and the rationale for evaluating the results promote consistency in theory construction and testing. According to Miller, "if anything, scientific concern for systematic, careful verification of knowledge claims has relaxed the hold of personal authority as a source of knowledge."[2] With the acceptance of methods from the natural sciences, social scientists could "order the experienced world" according to a shared logic.

A brief summary of the steps in the development of covering law theory, as an example of the scientific approach, illustrates this logic.[3] Broadly, in the development of covering law theory, the researcher starts with an observation or experience which generates a question about the phenomenon and procedes according to the following steps:[4]

Step 1: Isolate, define and illustrate the phenomenon.
Although later specification will occur, in this first step the scientist must clearly describe what he/she intends to study and differentiate that phenomenon from other phenomena as precisely as possible.

Step 2: Identification of theoretical units.
The description of the phenomenon must be explicitly narrowed in four ways: identifying particular units (attributes or variables); defining the values of the units; and indicating the interrelationships between or among the units.

Step 3: Stating the laws.
Laws are the formal statements of relationships among the units. They must be general enough to cover all values of the units--covering laws.

Step 4: Statement of the propositions.
More specific statements of the general laws are made. These propositions link specific values of one unit with specific values of another unit at a conceptual level.

Step 5: Development of hypotheses.
Hypotheses are empirically testable modifications of the propositions. The theoretical units are operationalized by identifying empirical indicators which can be quantitatively measured.

Step 6: The hypotheses are tested in the conduct of the research procedures specified in the research design.

Step 7: the results of the research are statistically evaluated and the hypotheses are supported or rejected according to some appropriate a priori criteria of acceptability.

As an approach to the study of phenomena, the above steps of the development of covering law theory illustrate some general

characteristics of the scientific approach. The researcher attempts to make the entire research process as objective as possible. Prior to conducting the research there is clear identification of what will be studied, how it will be studied, and what the expectations of the results would be in order to support the theory. The approach is deductive, examining a specific instance, or a relationship between variables, predicted by a generalization. If the relationship is observed to exist or to exist in the predicted order, then the original generalization is supported.[5] The literature variously describes the scientific approach as a process and logic of verification, justification, judgement, deduction and certification. This approach starts with a conclusion and then investigates the accuracy of that conclusion by observing whether or not it occurs in a specific instance.

Scientific observation translates phenomena into quantifiable terms for mathematical analysis. This quantification of variables underlies concepts of probability and generalizabilty. The method does not allow for the precise prediction of the exact relationship for any particular case or individual; rather, the method allows for the prediction of varying relationships across individuals or cases that meet the boundary criteria previously specified.

Pearce's four theoretical bases extend this overview of a logical-empirical approach. First, the subject matter can be defined as objective (vs. subjective). For example, if one investigates the social interaction of two individuals in a friendship, the focus could be on behaviors that are categorized

and quantified as friendship behaviors. This conceptualization assumes that there is something labeled friendship apart from the interaction or process of acting on the part of the two individuals--a reification of friendship. As a concept, friendship can be studied as a particular reality applicable to particular relationships.

Pearce's second point, the identification and observation of analytical units, constrasts units on two issues: "the choice between molar and molecular observational units and that between nomothetic (general, universal) and idiosyncratic analytical units."[6] A scientific approach requires that observational units should be as narrow, precise, discrete and isolated as possible.[7] Any variations other that the variation in the researcher manipulated variables are to be eliminated. Ambiguity in the observational units weakens the validity of the research, and the requirement for precision in specification leads to the study of "molecular" observational units which are related to a more general explanatory framework. According to this perspective, conclusions about friendship relations are drawn by observing a specific behavioral variable such as the frequency of face-to-face contacts between two individuals.

Social science focuses on general analytical units; one studies groups of individuals or "subjects," instead of idiosyncratic studies which highlight individual differences. Statistical analysis is based on inferences drawn from multiple observation points analyzed as a single measure. For example, frequency of face-to-face contact would be measured for several

pairs of interactants, and the conclusion made would apply to the entire collection of pairs. Individual differences are calculated in the process, but the result is only of interest in terms of the whole group.[8]

Pearce's third comparison is particularly relevant to the study of speech communication. Social scientists have adapted empirical methods from natural sciences. Applying methods developed for the study of inanimate objects to human behavior can lead to treating people as objects. According to Pearce, "Natural science (generally) assumes a mechanistic model involving causal deterministic relations among variables which are reactive rather than proactive."[9] One conceptual issue which arises from the imposition of this model is the view of human behavior as either motion or action. O'Keefe describes a logical distinction between these terms: "the first (motion) is a purely physicalistic scheme in which persons are construed as nothing but physical organisms; the alternative is the action scheme, in which persons are construed as agents, beings who can act and who have intentions, motives, reasons, desires, and so forth."[10] He contrasts these views in the study of human communication as describing communicative behavior as action-talk or movement-talk. Non-empiricists seem to view logical empirical research as mechanistic, behavioristic, and as treating humans physicalistically. Logical empiricists writing in support of their approach deny such a strict characterization. Current application of scientific methodology appears to recognize the individual as agent to a greater degree than in the past;

however, the assumptions of their methods still lead to the conclusion that the logical empirical approach may be most useful if, or when, one can view human behavior as motion. For example, in a study of administrative hearings a technological change was introduced--teleconferences were substituted for face-to-face interaction.[11] The research investigated interaction differences between the two modes. Measurements included the number of words said, the number of questions asked, the number of participants present, and the number of documents submitted. The assumption underlying this investigation was that a technological change might produce a behavioral change on the above variables. The nature of the interaction might be changed in other ways; however, the purpose of the research and the applications for which it was designed did not require analysis of other behavioral variables. The researchers needed to know if input and/or output in a human interaction system significantly changed when the technology of the system changed. The motion-talk assumption seems to have been compatible with this research approach.

Pearce's final comparison, structure of explanation, asks the question: what is the goal of the research? Traditionally, the goals of science are explanation, prediction and control. More specifically, these goals rely upon a hypthetico-deductive model linking theory with observation. O'Keefe describes theories as "axiomatized systems of mathematical logic, connected to experience by operational definitions,"[12] which result in cumulative bodies of scientific knowledge. A powerful theory can be used to explain how variables are related; a precise theory can serve to predict the future occurence or outcome of the

interaction of variables; and each form can be applied to direct human behavior.[13]

Humanistic Approach

Humanistic approach is a purposefully general term. Many diverse and possibly conflicting research techniques are collapsed into this category. The common element of these techniques is the modification of strictly quantitative methodology to include aspects of qualitative methodology.

A scientific approach focuses on the analysis of variables constructed by researchers in accordance with a theory prior to the research. In contrast, a humanistic approach focuses on the subjective experience of the individual, the agent, and his/her experience prior to and along with the construction of theory and selection of appropriate methodology.

One modification of the traditional logical empirical approach is provided under the label of grounded theory.[14] Glaser and Strauss state that theory should be derived from data, not imposed upon it a priori: "We suggest as the best approach an initial, systematic discovery of the theory from the data of social research. Then one can be relatively sure that the theory will fit and work. And since the categories are discovered by examination of the data, laymen involved in the area to which the theory applies will usually be able to understand it."[15]

This approach emphasizes qualitative methodology in the initial stage of theory generation. Theory verification may

incorporate both qualitative and quantitative methodologies in testing whether or not the theory is useful and applicable to other instances of human behavior. Phillips indicts traditional human communication research with the following statement: "What is customarily measured in communication studies is ascribed rather than described."[16] Grounded theory is one method for modifying the level of ascription in the measurement process.

In an example of a humanistic approach, differences in how individuals spoke about "friends" were observed in interviews.[17] The researcher provided no structure for interviewees' statements and simply encouraged discussion about the topic. From the tapes of these interviews, several conclusions about the individuals, about friends and about interviews were made. At some later point, the researcher returned to the transcripts with a set of categories developed for fantasy theme analysis.[18] A review of the data indicated that each interviewee could be easily classified with this system. Subsequently, one of the participants reviewed the description of his interview and categorization. He agreed with the analysis and classification, lending subjective support to the approach. Although this project continued no further, I believe it provides a potential base for further research in which the participants are involved in the refinement of categories.[19]

According to Pearce's four bases of contrast, the subject matter of humanistic research can be both objective and subjective. My interpretation of grounded theory would indicate that a researcher begins with subjective data which relies upon

the individual's subjective view of reality. A distortion of this data occurs as it is objectified for empirical validation of the theory. The researcher does not actually study "the interpretation of behaviors as they are constructed by the actor or the community;"[20] rather, he/she uses the actors' interpretations of their behaviors after they have occurred in order to establish a grounded theory. Subsequently, the researcher may objectify that data for quantitative theory validation.

The identification of observational and analytical units in a humanistic approach depends upon the nature and purpose of each investigation. As in the friendship interview example, one of the techniques of the grounded theory approach is to establish categories; consequently, a move toward reductionism is inherent in this process. One might be categorizing types of systems of interaction, or communication strategies, or the usage of a "friendship term." Such breadth in potential range of the categories also allows for different methodological applications to suit different purposes. As with traditional science, however, if the researcher is relying on quantitative methodology for theory verification, then the observational and analytical units would not be incorporated in idiosyncratic studies which emphasize individual differences.

The third comparative basis, concept of human action, seems to be the most problematic for the humanistic approach. While recognizing the importance of the actor as agent, as proactive in some respects, the research may result in a physicalistic,

reactive conceptualization of human action in its verification stage. Currently, this issue is an unresolved difficulty in humanistic research. Pearce introduces this point of comparison by asking the question, is human action meaningful in some way which natural phenomena are not? The humanistic approach seems to answer the question with a yes, but it can simultaneously test the validity of the theory with methods leading one to assume the answer is no.

Finally, the goal of humanistic research is not so different from the goal of logical empirical research. The example of grounded theory seems to emphasize generation of theory as a goal which can be accomplished both qualitatively and quantitatively:

> Our position in this book is as follows: there is no fundamental clash between the purposes and capacities of qualitative and quantitative methods or data. What clash there is concerns the primacy of emphasis on verification or generation of theory. . .we believe that each form is useful. . .(and) in many instances, both forms of data are necessary.[21]

Phenomenological Approach

The phenomenological approach to social science research presents an extremely different view of the assumptions about the nature of reality, human language, human action, the procedures for investigating phenomena, and the goals of research. Although this approach can be applied in many fields of social science, it seems particularly suited to the field of speech communication due to its emphasis on language and the users of language.

The description of this approach will begin with Pearce's four theoretical bases of comparison. First, Pearce provided two responses to the question, what is the definition of the subject

matter--objective or subjective? Phenomenology rejects this dichotomy: phenomenological intentionality is a concept that unites the individual with the "other." A subject/object distinction would allow one to say, "I am conscious," and "this is the object of my consciousness." From a phenomenological perspective the I and the other are united in the act of consciousness; consciousness becomes consciousness of, through language. Three approaches in this essay can be contrasted on this issue: traditional science focuses on some reality outside of the individual and his/her experience; a humanistic approach adds greater recognition of the processes which occur within the individual and his or her experience; phenomenology focuses on the relationship between the individual and his or her experience: "In an interpersonal exchange, one person is not a subject acting on another, an object, because without both people being present, no communication could happen. The two people form a relationship unique to that situation and exchange. The meaning of the communication cannot be possessed by only one person's internal perceptions; the relationship is an inseparable unit."[22] The definition of the subject matter for phenomenological research is that relationship, a reality which is constituted through "language-in-use." Jurick defines language-in-use as a term which includes the language itself as well as the human user of the language, thereby indicating that words have meaning and words also have an intended meaning as they are spoken by an individual.[23]

If the subject matter of phenomenological research occurs between people in the constitution of reality, then it becomes

apparent that the subject matter is process. The variables of traditional scientific research, the whats, may be relevant to a description of the elements and individuals interacting in the relationship; however, the focus is on how or the process of interaction which results in a constituted reality.

The observational and analytical units of the phenomenological approach are unknown prior to the analysis of language-in-use. Typically, discourse analysis is the methodology utilized in phenomenological research. However, to state that units of discourse represent the observational and analytical units is somewhat misleading as it omits the equal part played by the individual in the act of intending those units of discourse. A more comprehensive phenomenological phrase which applies to Pearce's concept of unit is "the intersubjective language-in-use of interactants."

One further classification of this process involves the specification of the relationship between interactants' language-in-use and time. "This process of constituting "reality" in and through a creative, intersubjective use of words involves displaying a process of retrospective-prospective intending, interpreting, and understanding."[24] The intersubjective language-in-use, recorded in discourse, is the "body" from which observational and analytical units will be interpreted. The researcher is expected to approach this discourse without prior assumptions about the units. The thrust of the phenomenological method is to describe how the interactants are constituting a reality; that reality will be different in every instance of

discourse. That process will be different at every different point in time. The highly variable data of phenomenological description does not allow for the imposition of *a priori* conclusions about what one is looking at, what one is looking for, how one is going to look at/for whatever is there, and so forth.[25] Rather, the researcher must set aside personal assumptions (taken-for-granteds) and describe how the interactants intersubjectively accomplish whatever they can be observed to have been doing in the discourse.

The phenomenologist's concept of human behavior as retrospective-prospective intending, interpreting, and understanding is a clear and emphatic statement of human behavior as action. To conceive of human behavior as physicallistic motion within this framework would be inconsistent with everything else said about phenomenology.

Pearce's final basis of comparison is the structure of the explanation which results from each approach. The phenomenological approach does not aim at the scientific goals of explanation, prediction and control. The methods of phenomenological research do not provide verification of hypotheses and theory. The deductive model of social science is reversed: one begins with the data, and through description and interpretation, one inductively arrives at theory. The data must always precede in this approach. In opposition to a humanistic approach, the data is not used for the construction of hypotheses to be tested; rather, the theory is derived directly from the description of the data.

The goal of phenomenological research is understanding. Understanding of a phenomenon through these methods is gained through systematic description of possibilities manifest in the data. The researcher's interpretations of the constituted reality must be grounded in the data. All possibilities must be surfaced and supported by observation. A second step is the examination of these possibilities for some unifying essence. "One explicates essential unity by stripping content from the displayed manifestations to make visible the how of their constitution."[26] If the posited essential unity is demonstrable in the discourse, then the inductive procedure of the phenomenological approach arrives at the level of theory.

Figure 1 about here

Understanding the Phenomenon of Spoken Language

Each of the three approaches outlined above provides knowledge about the process of human communication. The knowledge derived from different approaches reflects the philosophical presuppositions of the approach. Traditional scientific methodologies produce epistemological knowledge--the method assumes a dichotomy between the knower and the known which makes knowledge possible. Phenomenological understanding is ontological--knowing is being--indicating the intersubjective relationship between the knower and known.

The objective methods of traditional social science provide speech communicatin scholars with theories of explanation,

	Definition of Subject Matter	Observational and Analytical Units	Concept of Human Action	Goal of the Research
SCIENTIFIC APPROACH	objective	molecular, nomothetic	motion	explanation, prediction, control
HUMANISTIC APPROACH	objective and subjective	molecular, nomothetic	motion and action	description, explanation, prediction, control
PHENOMENOLOGICAL APPROACH	subjective process	molar, idiosyncratic	action	description, understanding

Figure 1

prediction and control. The quantitative, probablistic nature of the theories created from this approach allow for useful, pragmatic, generalizable applications of knowledge about the communication process. The phenomenological perspective emphasizing the relationship between subject and object provide potentially useful, pragmatic, and generalizable theories although this approach has not yet reached that level of applicability.

A complex phenomenon such as spoken language can be studied in many different ways. One can conceive of humans behaving mechanistically in some contexts. At the same time, behavior in the same context can be viewed from a phenomenological perspective if the researcher is interested in how the interactants intersubjectively constitute what the empiricists study as mechanistic behavior. Variations of the humanistic approach represent current attempts to expand empirical research to include less objective conceptions of humans and to recognize human action in the communication process. Much of the current literature supports a pluralistic view of methods appropriate to the study of spoken language. No single perspective can provide a full explanation of the process as well as an understanding of the "processing." Attempts to combine traditional and more phenomenological methods have not yet demonstrated their utility. Although one can appreciate the goals of such attempts, one cannot do two different things, based on two different philosophies of human behavior, asking distinctly different kinds of questions at the same time. The humanistic approach has the potential for wedding the traditional and phenomenological by utilizing the

approaches at different points in the entire research process.

One of the criticisms of the scientific approach to the study of human behavior is that humans are not reactive objects, and that we must necessarily violate some of the presuppositions of science when it is applied to humans. In other words, those who "do science" do not do it well.[27] The criticism may be justified, but the response should not be to stop studying speech communication with scientific methods. Rather, improve those methods; recognize the limitations of the approach in ever attaining a complete understanding of human communication. Similarly, qualitative methods require continued refinement and development in order to answer the questions accessible through those methods as well.

Speech communication researchers must make a choice as to which approach to use first, or which approach is more personally interesting, or which kinds of questions need to be studied given the already existing understanding of human communication. There appear to be several groups within the discipline: empiricists who explicitly accept and advocate quantitative procedures; empiricists who conduct quantitative research and have little appreciation for the implications of their philosophical presuppositions; empiricists who defensively conduct quantitative research with cosmetic attempts at qualitative modifications; and those who understand and advocate qualitative research. In all groups there are those who do what they do well and those who do it poorly. There is no need for us all to adopt the same

perspective or compromise the potential of any method by moving to some ill-formed middle ground. All forms of research will improve if we create a stronger awareness of the assumptions behind our work.

NOTES

[1] W. Barnett Pearce, "Metatheoretical Concerns in Communication," Communication Quarterly, 25 (1977), 3-6. Pearce has argued that the description of speech is aparadigmatic. "Following Kuhn's revised descriptions of paradigms, two criteria may be specified as the test for the existence of a paradigm: the occurrence of relatively complete communication among scientists and their ability to render unanimous judgments about relevant issues. These criteria are not presently met (in speech communication)."

Pearce offers four theoretical bases for comparing alternative forms of conducting scientific research. I am modifying and adapting his four points of comparison to contrast alternative forms of research.

[2] Gerald R. Miller, " 'Tis the Season to be Jolley: A Yuletide 1980 Assessment of Communication Research," Human Communication Research, 7 (1981), 371-377.

[3] For this summary I have drawn on Robert Dubin, Theory Building, revised ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1978), p. 7. A more concise presentation of the covering law theory is presented in Charles R. Berger, "The Covering Law Perspective as a Theoretical Basis for the Study of Human Communication," Communication Quarterly, 25 (1977), 7-18.

[4] This outline of steps illustrates the structure of the process but does not attempt to display the complexity inherent in each. For example, units can be interrelated in a variety of ways; laws can take a variety of forms; not all research begins at the beginning specified here.

[5] More accurately, the scientific approach depends upon falsification. If the predicted or hypothesized relationship is not observed, then the generalization from which is was constructed is not supported. Scientific knowledge is tentative; if the research is considered to be a valid and reliable test of the hypothesis, then the researcher can conclude that the theory is reasonable, plausible and adequate to explain the phenomenon for the present time but always subject to future falsification. The only statements that can be made with certainty, under the same conditions, are statements of what is not "true" or what is not supported by the particular test.

[6] Pearce, p. 4.

[7] Taylor describes three necessary conditions for scientific study: a) Any phenomenon studied must have absolute, not relative boundaries free from external influences; b) All or any variables studied must be capable of perceptual isolation and numerical variability; c) All states of the system studied, past, present and future must be describable in the same range of concepts as values of the same variables. See C. Taylor, " Interpretation and the Sciences of Man," in Interpretive Social Sciences: A Reader, ed. P. Rabinow and W.M. Sullivan (Berkeley,

California: University of Southern California Press, 1979), pp. 68-69.

[8] Social scientists are sometimes interested in individual differences; within group variance may be critical to particular studies. The point of the statement in the text may be illustrated by the example of frequency of face-to-face contact. The mean number of face-to-face contacts established by "friends" may be calculated as twelve while "acquaintances" made contact a mean of seven times. No pairs of friends or acquaintances may have actually met twelve or seven times respectively.

[9] Pearce, p. 7.

[10] Daniel J. O'Keefe quoting Charles Landesman, "The New Dualism in the Philosophy of Mind," Review of Metaphysics, 19 (1965), 329; in Daniel J. O'Keefe, "Logical Empiricism and the Study of Human Communication," Speech Monographs, 42 (1975), 175.

[11] Jerome R. Corsi, Lawrence B. Rosenfeld, Gene D. Fowler, Kathryn H. Konopka, Darwin Niekerk and Julie D. Bell," The Use of Teleconferencing in Administrative Fair Hearings: Final Report of the Fair Hearing Project," University of Miami Journal of Law, in press, Winter 1984.

[12] O'Keefe, p. 171.

[13] The differences among these goals can lead to differing emphases in theory construction; O'Keefe and Dubin offer insights into the different logical structures of theory and the movement between theory and research as affected by particular goals.

[14] Glaser and Strauss discuss the general method of comparative analysis as a means of generating theory in Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research (New York: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967). In an elaboration of the different uses of data--generation and/or verification of theory--the authors develop the potential for both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.

[15] Glaser and Strauss, p. 15.

[16] Gerald M. Phillips, "Science and the Study of Human Communication: An Inquiry from the other Side of Two Cultures," Human Communication Research, 7 (1981), 366.

[17] One violation of a grounded theory apporoach evident in this example is the source of the system of categories. However, prior, extensive experience with the data was the basis for perceiving this set of categories as one which might fit the data. Additionally, the three categories implemented were extremely general: themes in the interviews could be categorized as emphasizing scene, action or character. Further initial work with additional interviewees and these general categories might lead to the specification and narrowing of more relevant, grounded categories.

[18] For example, Q methodology incorporates a grounded theory approach with qualitative methods of theory generation and quantitative mthods of verification. Q methodology might be a reasonable technique in the example of friends; Cragan and

Shields have previously used this technique with fantasy theme analysis in John Cragan and Don Shields, Applied Communication Research: A Dramatistic Approach (Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc., 1981).

Additional methodological approaches should be incorporated in this section. Examples which occur in the current literature are constructivism, the coordinated management of meaning, and rules theory.

[19] Grossberg and O'Keefe refer to a group of theor sts who combine quantitative and qualitative methodologies as the "new dualists" in Lawrence Grossberg and Daniel J. O'Keefe, "Presuppositions, Conceptual Foundations and Communication Theory: On Hawes' Approach to Communication," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 61 (1975), 195-208.

[20] Pearce, p. 5.

[21] Glaser and Strauss, pp. 17-18.

[22] Ronald C. Arnett, "Toward a Phenomenological Dialogue," Western Journal of Speech Communication, 45 (1981), 206.

[23] Donna M. Jurick, "Criteria for Adequacy in the Analysis of Discourse," paper presented to the Speech Communication Association annual meeting, Anaheim, California, Nov. 3, 1982, pp. 1-2.

[24] Jurick, p. 2.

[25] Procedural rules for observing phenomenologically are specified in Severyn T. Bruyn, The Human Perspective in Sociology,

(Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 277. I do not mean to imply that there are no considerations to be made prior to entering the data; those considerations, however, are methodological guidelines for how the researcher should approach any body of data, not assumptions about particular data.

[26] Jurick, p. 12.

[27] A discussion of the many criticisms of science will not be developed in this essay. The theme of the following articles is that those who conduct scientific research falsely believe it to be an objective, value-free activity. Dennis S. Gouran, "Fundamental Issues in the Criticism of Communication Theory and Research," Central States Speech Journal, 30 (1979), pp. 40-50; David R. Siebold, "Criticisms of Communication Theory and Research: A Critical Celebration," Central States Speech Journal, 30 (1979), pp. 25-39; Ruth Anne Clark, "Suggestions for the Design of Empirical Communicative Studies," Central States Speech Journal, 30 (1979), pp. 51-66; James A. Kelso, "Science and the Rhetoric of Reality," Central States Speech Journal, 31 (1980), pp. 17-29; Gerald M. Phillips, "Science and the Study of Human Communication: An Inquiry from the Other Side of Two Cultures," Human Communication Research, 7 (1981), pp. 361-370; Ernest G. Bormann, "The Paradox and Promise of Small Group Communication Revisited," Central States Speech Journal, 31 (1980), pp. 214-220; and Goodall and Phillips.

REFERENCES

Arnett, Ronald C., "Toward a Phenomenological Dialogue," Western Journal of Speech Communication 45 (Summer 1981), 201-212.

Bormann, Ernest G., "The Paradox and Promise of Small Group Communication Revisited," Central States Speech Journal 31 (Fall 1980), 214-220.

Brodbeck, May, Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science (ed.). (Toronto: Macmillan Co., 1968).

Bruyn, Severyn T. The Human Perspective in Sociology. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966).

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs, "The Nature of Criticism in Rhetorical and Communicative Studies," Central States Speech Journal 30 (Spring 1979), 4-13.

Clark, Ruth Anne, "Suggestions for the Design of Empirical Communicative Studies," Central States Speech Journal 30 (Spring 1979), 51-66.

Cragan, John and Don Shields, Applied Communication Research: A Dramatistic Approach. (Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc., 1981).

Dance, Frank E.X. Human Communication Theory: Comparative Essays. (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1982).

Deetz, Stanley, "Words Without Things: Toward a Social Phenomenology of Language," Quarterly Journal of Speech 59 (1973), 40-51.

Dubin, Robert, Theory Building, revised ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1978).

Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. (New York: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967).

Goodall, H. Lloyd and Gerald M. Philips, "Assumption of the Burden: Science or Criticism?" Communication Quarterly 29 (Fall 1981), 283-296.

Gouran, Dennis S., "Fundamental Issues in the Criticism of Communication Theory and Research," Central States Speech Journal 30 (Spring 1979), 40-50.

Grossberg, Lawrence and Daniel J. O'Keefe, "Presuppositions, Conceptual Foundations and Communication Theory: On Hawes' Approach to Communication, " Quarterly Journal of Speech 61 (April 1975), 195-208.

Hawes, Leonard C., "Toward a Hermeneutic Phenomenology of Communication," Communication Quarterly 25 (Summer 1977), 30-41.

Jurick, Donna M., "A Conversational Analysis of Competitive and Cooperative Dyads," paper presented at the Speech Communication Association annual meeting, San Antonio, Texas, November 12, 1979.

Jurick, Donna M., "Criteria for Adequacy in the Analysis of Discourse," paper presented at the Speech Communication Association annual meeting, Anaheim, California, November 13, 1981.

Jurick, Donna M., "Discourse Analysis: A Phenomenological Orientation," paper presented at the Seminar on the Analysis of Conversation, Speech Communication Association annual meeting, New York, November 13, 1980.

Jurick, Donna M., "The Enactment of Returning: A Naturalistic Study of Talk," Communication Quarterly 25 (Summer 1977), 21-29.

Kelso, James A., "Science and the Rhetoric of Reality," Central States Speech Journal 31 (Spring 1980), 17-29.

Kuhn, Thomas S., The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 2nd ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970).

Miller, Gerald R., " 'Tis the Season to Be Jolly: A Yuletide 1980 Assessment of Communication Research," Human Communication Research 7 (Summer 1981), 371-377.

Nofsinger, Robert E., Jr., "A Peek at Conversational Analysis," Communication Quarterly 25 (Summer 1977), 12-20.

O'Keefe, Daniel J., "Logical Empiricism and the Study of Human Communication," Speech Monographs 42 (August 1975), 169-183.

Pearce, W. Barnett, "Metatheoretical Concerns in Communication," Communication Quarterly 25 (Winter 1977), 3-6.

Pearce, W. Barnett, "Naturalistic Study of Communication: Its Function and Form," Communication Quarterly 25 (Summer 1977), 51-56.

Phillips, Gerald M., "Science and the Study of Human Communication: An Inquiry from the other Side of Two Cultures," Human Communication Research 7 (Summer 1981), 361-370.

Siebold, David R., "Criticism of Communication Theory and Research: A Critical Celebration," Central States Speech Journal 30 (Spring 1979), 25-39.

Stewart, John, "Philosophy of Qualitative Inquiry: Hermeneutic Phenomenology and Communication Research," Book Review, Quarterly Journal of Speech 67 (1981), 109-120.

Taylor, C., "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man," in P. Rabinow and W.M. Sullivan (eds.), Interpretive Social Science: A Reader. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 68-69.